

JARBIDGE RIVER BULL TROUT RECOVERY TEAM

Draft Meeting Summary

Date and Time: October 25, 2005 – 8:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.

Location: NDOW Eastern Region Office, Elko, Nevada

Team Members Present: Tim Burton (BLM-Boise), Tim Dykstra (Duck Valley Shoshone-Paiute Tribes), John Elliott (NDOW-Elko), Jim Harvey (USFS-Sparks), Rich Haskins (NDOW-Reno), Gary Johnson (NDOW-Elko), Maija Meneks (USFS-Elko), Chris Reign (FWS-Boise), Melissa Schnier (BLM-Burley), Selena Werdon (FWS-Reno), Bob Williams (FWS-Reno)

Team Members Absent: Doug Megargle (IDFG-Jerome) – new baby on the way!

After the round of introductions, Bob, Rich, and Selena gave a brief overview of how the bull trout listing and recovery process has gone to date and how recovery planning should proceed. In short, the agencies in Nevada have had differing viewpoints on the status and recovery needs of Jarbidge River bull trout, the prior recovery planning process was sporadic due to other FWS priorities and timeframes, the first recovery team was not as fully involved as needed, the overall recovery plan format and content were set on a range-wide rather than local basis, and there was no direct stakeholder involvement in plan development.

As the first step in restarting the recovery planning process, this new recovery team is being formed. NDOW and FWS are co-leading the new team, with Gary and Selena as the designated agency leads. The initial goal of the team is to develop a revised draft recovery plan for the Jarbidge River population that is agreed upon by the team members and incorporates stakeholder input. The team will initially meet approximately once a month (3-4 meetings). At this time there is no official deadline, however the FWS would like the team to have a revised draft plan ready for public review within 3-6 months (by May 2006).

The team discussed whether or not there was a need for additional recovery team members with other technical expertise. The consensus decision was that if other expertise (*e.g.*, genetics) was needed, the team could bring in an outside expert (via conference call or in person) to participate in those discussions without having them as an official member of the team. This would keep the technical team at a manageable size and reduce meeting scheduling conflicts.

The team then reviewed a list of organizations and entities related to public and private activities that occur throughout the Jarbidge River watershed and discussed which to invite to participate on a stakeholder team. The team discussed inviting Elko County (NV), Owyhee County (ID), Jarbidge Town Advisory Board, Murphy Hot Springs representative, Jarbidge Bull Trout Task Force, The Nature Conservancy, Nevada Wildlife Federation, Idaho Cattle Association, Nevada Cattleman's Association, Idaho Mining Association, Nevada Mining Association, outfitters and guides, Trout Unlimited, Nevada Division of Forestry, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Elko County Conservation Association, Public Land Use Advisory Committee, and Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife to participate in an upcoming stakeholder meeting, as well as other groups identified in a Forest-wide travel management plan.

Potential meeting locations were discussed that would encourage local stakeholder participation including Jarbidge, Jackpot, Three Creek School, and the USFS's Pole Creek Guard Station.

The team also discussed the possibility of partially funding stakeholder participation, if needed, on a case-by-case basis. The FWS would like to request the stakeholder team members continued participation not just during plan development, but also during recovery implementation.

Tim B. informed the team of how the Watershed Advisory Groups (WAGs) in Idaho involved stakeholders. There the lead agency invited individuals, paid for their travel, and facilitated the meetings. That stakeholder group was a decision-making body with its own team lead, which voted on resolutions and provided its own recommendations. Meeting materials were sent to the participants ahead of time from the lead agency. At the first meeting, the technical team covered watershed issues and presented lists of questions to the stakeholders. The entire technical team was present at WAG meetings. The WAGs met every other month for a full day, immediately after the technical team meetings.

Bob and Rich agreed to jointly sign and send out a stakeholder invitation letter in early December. The draft letter would be sent out to the team for review. For the letter, Chris recommended emphasizing benefits to the watershed/ecosystem function and other species in addition to bull trout.

Tim D. requested that at least one stakeholder meeting be held in either Mountain City or Owyhee, so that Tribal Council members would have the opportunity to participate. Also, Tim recommended keeping the council on the mailing list for meetings elsewhere. The Council would like to see information added to the draft recovery plan on tribal historical use of the Jarbidge area.

Tim B. pointed out that the team needs to know when and where bull trout are located and the habitat conditions. Rich stated that it is important for the team to come to consensus on what the base bull trout population is and to be able to detect the effects of future recovery actions on bull trout population numbers. Tim B. discussed screw traps that are used in Idaho for bull trout population estimates. Rich noted that a number of survey techniques (snorkeling, electrofishing, trapping) may be required to adequately survey Jarbidge bull trout streams.

For the first stakeholder meeting, Tim B. recommended covering the reasons the stakeholders are invited (goals) and providing background information on what bull trout need, the uniqueness of this bull trout population, its vulnerability to extinction, factors that cause extinction elsewhere, and factors for this population. The stakeholders would then be invited to pick out issues to address and brainstorm on potential solutions. Rich recommended using the recovery action narrative from the previous draft recovery plan to identify activities that stakeholders can be involved in, such as projects related to riparian areas, mining, livestock grazing, fishing, and other forms of recreation. The team wants to encourage stakeholders to review and comment on the draft plan to be part of the solution.

The FWS agreed to send team members copies of documents pertaining to the draft recovery plan, such as past team meeting minutes, comment letters, and cited data/reports including fish population or stream habitat data (including the Jarbidge key watershed problem assessment from Idaho). NDOW agreed to send the team members copies of their draft *Bull Trout Species*

Management Plan for the Nevada Portion of the Jarbidge River Drainage Basin (Note: Also available online).

For the next meeting, the list of items to complete or start addressing included:

- provide copies of relevant documents (FWS and NDOW)
- presentation on stream temperature data (Gary)
- develop a database of all fish/habitat data, including GPS points
- team members present work that agencies have in progress or completed since the last recovery team meeting (May 1, 2003)
- develop realistic, achievable recovery criteria for abundance
- develop comprehensive population/habitat survey protocols
- develop text on tribal use
- incorporate new information to update the old draft plan
- identify data gaps
- ensure agency comments have been incorporated into the old draft plan
- identify potential projects for funding and develop priority rankings
- prepare for stakeholder meeting to follow technical team meeting

Melissa pointed out that there is a need to coordinate implementation of the subbasin assessment that the USFS and BLM are working on with the recovery team.

The next recovery team meeting was scheduled for November 30, followed by the first stakeholder meeting on December 1, 2005, in Jackpot, Nevada. (Note: Both meetings are now scheduled for December 1)